

REMARKS / ARGUMENTS

Status of Claims

Claims 1-20 are currently pending in the subject application. Claims 1-20 stand rejected.

Rejections

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1-4 and 7-14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) by the Examiner as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US 2002/0014940 issued of Eiichiro Kondo et al. (hereinafter referred to as “Kondo”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,094,122 issued to Todd Christopher Sexton (hereinafter referred to as “Sexton”).

The Examiner asserts that Kondo discloses all of the elements of the invention as claimed in claims 1-4 and 7-14 except for the core being ferromagnetic. To more particularly point out and distinctly claim the present invention, claims 1 and 11 are hereby amended. Amendments of claims 1 and 11 are not admissions of merit to the Examiner’s 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of claims 1 and 11, and the Applicant asserts that claims broader than claims 1 and 11 may appropriately be asserted in this or related applications.

The Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner’s finding that the Kondo-Sexton combination obviates the present invention as claimed, especially as claims 1 and 11 are hereby amended. The Applicants asserts that neither Kondo nor Sexton, alone or in combination, teach all of the limitations of independent claims 1 or 11. With regard to claim 1, the Kondo-Sexton combination does not teach, “at least the winding that at least in part surrounds the other winding comprises at least one portion having a winding density that is greater than the remaining winding density...,” as required by claim 1. With regard to claim 11, the Kondo-Sexton

combination does not teach, “at least one portion of at least the winding that at least partially surrounds the other winding having a winding density that is greater than the remaining winding density ...,” as required by claim 11.

Kondo teaches a secondary bobbin 2 between a center core 1 and a secondary coil 3, the secondary coil 3 being formed around the secondary bobbin 2, a primary bobbin 4 between the secondary coil 3 and the primary coil 5, and the primary coil 5 being formed around the primary bobbin 4. (paragraphs 0039-0045). It is clear that the primary coil 5 at least partially surrounds the secondary coil 3. Further, it is clear that in each of the embodiments the primary coil 5 is of constant winding density (see Figures 1-5) and that “the primary coil 5 wound around the primary bobbin 4 is a several-layered laminated coil having totally 100 to 300 turns in which each single coil layer is composed of a coil having 50-60 turns formed by an enamel wire having wire diameter of 0.3mm to 1.0mm.” (paragraph 0042). The existence of an outer winding (that at least partially surrounds an inner winding) having a constant winding density is fully incompatible with claims 1 and 11. Similarly, Sexton does not teach the above-discussed limitation of claims 1 and 11. Instead, Sexton teaches a primary coil 56 disposed around the outside of a primary bobbin 50 and a secondary coil 58 disposed around the outside of a secondary bobbin 48 where the secondary bobbin 48 is disposed within the hollow interior of primary bobbin 50. (column 4 lines 54-57). Here too, the outer primary coil 56 is shown has a constant winding density (see Figure 27) which is not compatible with the above-described requirements of claims 1 and 11.

Accordingly, the Applicant submits that claims 1 and 11 (and claims 2-4, 7-10 and 12-14 at least due to their dependence from claims 1 and 11), are in condition for allowance and request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-4 and 7-14 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Claims 5-6 and 15-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) by the Examiner as being unpatentable over the Kondo-Sexton combination as applied to claim 1 and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,099,510 issued to Pierre Perrier et al. (hereinafter referred to as “Perrier”).

The Applicant reasserts here the above arguments that explain why the Kondo-Sexton combination does not meet all of the requirements of claims 1. Since Perrier also does not disclose the above-discussed limitations of claim 1, the Kondo-Sexton-Perrier combination cannot be held to obviate the present invention as claimed. More specifically, none of the Kondo-Sexton-Perrier combination teach or suggest, “at least the winding that at least in part surrounds the other winding comprises at least one portion having a winding density that is greater than the remaining winding density...,” as required by claim 1. With regard to claim 11, the Kondo-Sexton-Perrier combination does not teach, “at least one portion of at least the winding that at least partially surrounds the other winding having a winding density that is greater than the remaining winding density ...,” as required by claim 11.

Accordingly, the Applicant submits that claims 5-6 and 15-20 are in condition for allowance and request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 5-6 and 15-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Conclusion

For all of the foregoing reasons and in view of the foregoing amendments, Applicant respectfully contends that the application is now in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests entry of the foregoing amendments, reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-20, and issuance of a Patent for the subject invention. If the Examiner

Application No. 10/528,133
Response to Non-Final Office Action of March 26, 2007

cares to discuss anything presented here to further prosecution of this application, he is invited to contact the undersigned Attorney for the Applicant. Please charge any additional requisite fees relating to this amendment and response to Deposit Account No. 501581.

Respectfully submitted,

Barley Snyder
Customer No. 29450

/sa/
Salvatore Anastasi
Registration No. 39,090
Attorney for Applicant
Phone: (610) 722-3899
Facsimile: (610) 889-3699